REMARKS

Claims 1-22 are pending in this application. Of these, claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 10 and 13 are amended and claims 20-22 have been added herein. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the claims in view of the following remarks.

Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for indicating the allowable subject matter of claims 6-9.

Claim 2 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In particular, the Examiner has indicated that it is unclear how an optical component can be formed from a single optical piece when said single optical piece has a slit cut therein. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Applicant respectfully submits that claim 2 is clear as originally filed. As stated in the specification, "the combined TIR lens element 200 may be formed by taking a single optical piece and forming the air gap 213 as a slit in that single piece, where the air gap slit 213 separates the lens element 200a of the piece from the TIR prism element 200b." Sentence bridging pp. 8-9. This alternative is distinguished from the earlier embodiment where "[t]he combined TIR lens element 200 may be formed by joining two optical pieces together." Page 8, lines 22-23. In other words, claim 2 very clearly describes a single optical piece having a slit formed therein. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 2 meets the criteria of Section 112.

Claims 1, 2, and 5 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Winston, *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,303,322). In addition, claims 3 and 4 have been rejected under

PAGE 11/14 * RCVD AT 1/8/2004 4:01:06 PM [Eastern Standard Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-1/3 * DNIS:8729306 * CSID:9727329218 * DURATION (mm-ss):04-12

35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Winston, *et al.* in view of Poradish (U.S. Patent No. 5,905,545). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claim 1, as amended, specifically recites "a reflecting element having at least one substantially planar surface and a first curved lens surface" and a "lens element also having a second curved surface." The prior art of record does not teach or suggest an optical element with first and second curved surfaces. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is allowable over the references of record.

Claims 3, 4, and 22 depend from claim 1 and add further limitations. It is respectfully submitted that these dependent claims are allowable by reason of depending from an allowable claim as well as for adding further limitations.

Claim 2 specifically recites that "the optical component is formed of a single optical piece having a slit formed therein to separate at least a portion of the substantially planar surface of the reflecting element from at least a portion of the substantially planar surface of the lens element." As noted in the portion of Winston, *et al.* cited by the Examiner, the prior art teaches "a single refracting prism *coupled to* a wedge layer and with an integral lens." Col. 2, lines 21-23. Nowhere does Winston, *et al.* teach or suggest a single optical piece having a slit formed therein. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claim 2 is allowable over the references of record.

Claim 2 has also been clarified to indicate that the slit is "formed" in the single optical piece and that the slit separates at least a portion of the substantially planar surfaces. These amendments are not narrowing for purposes of patentability.

Claims 5, 20, and 31 depend from claim 2 and add further limitations. It is respectfully submitted that these dependent claims are allowable by reason of depending from an allowable claim as well as for adding further limitations.

PAGE 12/14 * RCVD AT 1/8/2004 4:01:06 PM [Eastern Standard Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-1/3 * DNIS:8729306 * CSID:9727329218 * DURATION (mm-ss):04-12

Claims 10-19 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Poradish. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claim 10, as amended, specifically recites "the reflecting element and the lens element are formed of a single optical piece having a slit formed therein to separate at least a portion of the substantially planar surface of the reflecting element from at least a portion of the substantially planar surface of the lens element." The prior art does not teach or suggest the limitations of claim 10. For example, Poradish teaches an adhesive 29 that holds the two prisms together. Col. 5, lines 35-36. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claim 10 is allowable over the references of record.

Claims 11-12 depend from claim 10 and add further limitations. It is respectfully submitted that these dependent claims are allowable by reason of depending from an allowable claim as well as for adding further limitations.

Claim 13, as amended, specifically recites "providing a single integrated optical component comprising a TIR prism element and a lens element wherein the single integrated optical component is placed in the illumination path and also in the reflection path, wherein the single integrated optical component comprises a single optical piece having a slit disposed therein." It is respectfully submitted that the prior art of record does not teach or suggest the limitations of claim 13. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claim 13 is allowable over the references of record.

Claims 14-19 depend from claim 13 and add further limitations. It is respectfully submitted that these dependent claims are allowable by reason of depending from an allowable claim as well as for adding further limitations.

PAGE 13/14 * RCVD AT 1/8/2004 4:01:06 PM [Eastern Standard Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-1/3 * DNIS:8729306 * CSID:9727329218 * DURATION (mm-ss):04-12

Applicant has made a diligent effort to place the claims in condition for allowance. In view of the above, Applicant respectfully submits that the application is in condition for allowance and requests that the Examiner pass the case to issuance.

Respectfully submitted,

1/8/04
Date

Ira S. Matsil
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 35,272

Slater & Matsil, L.L.P.
17950 Preston Rd., Suite 1000
Dallas, Texas 75252-5793
Tel. 972-732-1001
Fax: 972-732-9218

PAGE 14/14 * RCVD AT 1/8/2004 4:01:06 PM [Eastern Standard Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-1/3 * DNIS:8729306 * CSID:9727329218 * DURATION (mm-ss):04-12